

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated February 25, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-27 were previously pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-6, 8-21, 23-25 and 27 have been amended; and claims 7 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 19-21, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0043758, hereafter "Sorvari") in view of the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("the AAPA").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 19 and 27 to further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Specifically, as amended, independent claim 1 recites (in relevant part) the following features:

"[a]n application program prediction method by which a mobile terminal, having installed therein a plurality of application programs, predicts at least one application program that a user is likely to use, comprising:...

a usage history creating step of creating a usage history of the application program by storing the application program in association with the location of the mobile terminal when the application program is executed, the application program being executed in the application executing step, and the location of the mobile terminal being detected in the location detecting step; and

a predicting step of determining a predetermined location, searching for the location in the usage history, and presenting, as a prediction result, the application program associated with the location searched for in the usage history and the predetermined location,

wherein the predicting step includes a future location predicting step of predicting a future location of the mobile terminal, a specifying step of specifying, based on the usage history, an application program corresponding to the future location predicted in the future location predicting step, and a presenting step of presenting the application program specified in

the specifying step, as a prediction result of an application program that the user is likely to use in the future.” (Emphasis added).

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 19 and 27. Additionally, the above features of the present invention are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see e.g., pg. 25, line 1-pg. 26, line 1; and pg. 80, line 29-pg. 80, line 4).

The present invention, as recited in claims 1, 19 and 27, is directed to predicting application programs used by a mobile terminal which includes (i) accumulating a usage history of executed application programs in association with the locations at which the respective application programs were executed, (ii) predicting a destination a user (e.g., of a mobile terminal) is likely to go, based on a current location and time, (iii) determining an application program associated with the predicted destination, and (iv) presenting the application program to the user so that the application program is executed before the user arrives at the destination.

In other words, the present invention has the advantage of predicting a future location (i.e., destination) of a user (e.g., of a mobile terminal), and presenting an application program associated with the predicted destination at the current location of the mobile terminal.

The above features, as recited in claims 1, 19 and 27, are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Sorvari in view of the AAPA for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 27. Specifically, the Examiner relied on ¶ 0059, ¶ 0079, ¶ 0080 and ¶ 0093 of Sorvari; and pg. 1 of the AAPA.

However, Souvari (i.e., ¶ 0059, ¶ 0079, ¶ 0080 and ¶ 0093) discloses predicting an application program to be executed at a location by using a service usage history. For example, in the case where the service usage history shows that a certain application program was frequently executed at a current location, Souvari executes the application program at that current location.

On the other hand, the present invention predicts a future destination based on movement history, determines an application program associated with the predicted destination, and presents the user with the application program that the user may use in the future. For example,

in the case where the user activates the mobile terminal on the way to a train station, the mobile terminal determines the station to be the user's destination and displays times and train schedules as the application program associated with that train station. In contrast, Sorvari is not capable of presenting an application program for displaying such information because Sorvari cannot predict a user's destination, and determine an application program associated with the destination.

Conversely, the present invention predicts the user's destination, determines the application program and the content associated with the destination, and presents the information (e.g., the application/content) associated with the destination in advance. Since the teachings of Sorvari do not allow for the presentation of an application program associated with a destination, the present invention (as recited in claims 1, 19 and 27) is clearly different from Sorvari.

Moreover, the AAPA (i.e., pg. 1) merely discloses storing and executing application programs on a mobile terminal. Thus, the AAPA fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Sorvari.

Based on the above discussion, the Sorvari in view of the AAPA fails to disclose or suggest at least the following features recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 27:

- 1) creating a usage history of the application program by storing application programs in association with the location of the mobile terminal when the application program is executed;
- 2) predicting a future location of the mobile terminal,
- 3) specifying, based on the usage history, an application program corresponding to the future location predicted, and
- 4) presenting the application program specified as a prediction result of an application program that the user is likely to use in the future.

Therefore, no combination of Sorvari and the AAPA would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1, 19 and 27. Additionally, no combination of Sorvari and the AAPA would result in, or otherwise render obvious, dependent claims 2, 3, 20, 21 and 26 by virtue of their respective dependency on independent claims 1 and 19.

In the Office Action, claims 4-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sorvari in view of the AAPA, and further in view of Gong (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0163311, hereafter “Gong”). Claims 4-6 depend from independent claim 1. As noted above, Sorvari and the AAPA fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 1. Additionally, Gong fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Sorvari and the AAPA. Thus, no combination of Sorvari, the AAPA and Gong would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 4-6 by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, claims 7, 16, 22 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari in view of the AAPA, and further in view of Pearce (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,125, hereafter “Pearce”). Claims 7 and 22 have been canceled rendering the above rejection to those claims moot. Additionally, claim 16 depends from independent claim 1; and claim 24 depends from independent claim 19. As noted above, Sorvari and the AAPA fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 19. Pearce also fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in independent claims 1 and 19. Thus, no combination of Sorvari, the AAPA and Pearce would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 16 and 24 by virtue of their respective dependency on independent claims 1 and 19.

In the Office Action, claims 8, 9, 14, 15 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari, the AAPA and Pearce, and further in view of Horvitz (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0014491, hereafter “Horvitz”); claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari, the AAPA, Pearce and Horvitz, and further in view of Duley (U.S. Patent No. 5,459,671, hereafter “Duley”); and claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari, the AAPA, Pearce, Horvitz and Duley, and further in view of Salmimaa et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0160817, hereafter “Salmimaa”).

Claims 8, 9, 14 and 15 depend from independent claim 1; and claim 23 depends from independent claim 19. As noted above, Sorvari, AAPA and Pearce fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 19. Additionally, Horvitz, Duley and Salmimaa fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in independent claims 1 and 19. Thus, no combination of Sorvari, the AAPA, Pearce, Horvitz, Duley and Salmimaa would result in, or

otherwise render obvious, claims 8, 9, 14, 15 and 23 by virtue of their respective dependency on independent claims 1 and 19.

In the Office Action, claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari, the AAPA, Pearce and Horvitz, and further in view of Cantos (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,784, hereafter “Cantos”); claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari, the AAPA, Pearce, Horvitz and Cantos, and further in view of Salmimaa; and claims 17 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorvari, the AAPA and Pearce, and further in view of Gong.

Claims 12, 13, 17 depend from independent claim 1; and claim 25 depends from independent claim 19. As noted above, Sorvari, AAPA, Gong, Pearce, Horvitz and Salmimaa fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 19. Additionally, Cantos fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in independent claims 1 and 19. Thus, no combination of Sorvari, the AAPA, Gong, Pearce, Horvitz, Salmimaa and Cantos would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 12, 13, 17 and 25 by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1 and 19.

In light of the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the previous rejections to the claims and pass the application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Satoshi MATSUURA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.05.23 15:01:30 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 23, 2008